

Appln. No. 10/763,734
Amendment dated November 24, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed August 22, 2008

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Entry of the above amendments is courteously requested in order to place all claims in this application in allowable condition and/or to place the non-allowed claims in better condition for consideration on appeal.

Claims 1 through 5, 8, 10 through 13, 16 through 19, 21, 23, 25 and 27 remain in this application. Claims 6, 9, 14, 15, 20, 22, 24 and 26 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn. Claim 28 has been added.

Parts 1 through 8 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 4, 7, 11, 13, 16, 20, 23, 25 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Talluri.

Claims 1 through 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, 20, 22, 23 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebstyne in view of Talluri.

Claims 8 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebstyne in view of Talluri and further in view of Ebata.

Claims 10 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebstyne in view of Talluri and further in view of Wells.

Claims 12 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebstyne in view of Talluri and further in view of Watkins.

Appln. No. 10/763,734
Amendment dated November 24, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed August 22, 2008

Claims 10 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Talluri in view of Wells.

Claims 12 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Talluri in view of Watkins.

Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebstye in view of Talluri and further in view of Ebata and Watkins.

Claim 1 requires, in part, "wherein said designation of the minimum amount of disk storage space to be reserved is made at the at least one grid computer by the local user of the at least one grid computer and the minimum amount of disk storage space is not available for use by users of the computing grid". Claims 8, 13, and 21 include similar but not identical requirements.

It is submitted that the cited patents, and especially the various allegedly obvious combinations of Ebstye, Talluri, Ebata, Wells, and Watkins, set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claims 1, 7, 8, 13, 21 and 25. Further, claims 2, 4, 5, 10 and 11, which depend from claim 1, claim 3, which depends from claim 2, claim 12, which depends from claim 4, claims 16 through 19 which depend from claim 13 and claim 23, which depends from claim 3 also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 5, 7, 8, 10 through 13, 16 through 19, 21, 23, 25 and 27 is therefore respectfully requested.

Appln. No. 10/763,734
Amendment dated November 24, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed August 22, 2008

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date: Nov. 24, 2008

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. 40,158
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357